

(13)

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

S.B. : HON'BLE SHRI SATISH K. AGNIHOTRI, J.

M.C.C. No. 114 of 2007

PETITIONER

: Narendra Kumar Parekh, aged
40 years, S/o Shri panchilal
Parekh, R/o 228, Parekh
Mansion, Gudiyari Raipur
(C.G.)

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

- : 1. Umashankar Lal Shrivastava,
aged 82 years, S/O Nathu Lal
Shrivastava.
2. Smt. Padma Devi
Shrivastava, Aged 75 years.
W/O Shri Umashankar Lal
Shrivastava.
3. Suresh Kumar Shrivastava,
aged 53 years. S/O Shri
Umashankar Lal Shrivastava
4. Naresh Kumar Shrivastava,
Aged 51 years. S/O Shri
Umashankar Lal Shrivastava
5. Ramesh Kumar Shrivastava,
aged 49 years. S/O Shri
Umashankar Lal Shrivastava
6. Kumari Bharti Shrivastava,
aged 46 years. D/O Shri
Umashankar Lal Shrivastava
7. Dinesh Kumar Shrivastava,
aged 43 years. S/O Shri
Umashankar Lal Shrivastava
8. Mahesh Kumar Shrivastava,
aged 41 years. S/O Shri
Umashankar Lal Shrivastava

(14)

All R/O. Main Road
Pandri, Tehsil and District
Raipur (C.G.)

9. State of Chhattisgarh
Through: The Collector,
Raipur.

Present: Shri Y.C.Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.
Shri B.P.Sharma, Advocate for the respondents.
Shri Sushil Dubey, Government Advocate, for the
State/ respondent No.9.

ORDER

(Passed on 3rd of April, 2007)

1. This is an application for modification of the order dated 14.02.2007 passed in W.P. No. 412/2003. This order was passed in open Court wherein the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner had opportunity to correct the mistakes if any. The learned counsel did not do the needful at the time of hearing as well as at the time of passing of the order.
2. The present petition is filed stating that the submissions made by the respondents have not found place in the order. It is to my utter surprise that the learned counsel, despite being present in the Court when the order was passed, did not state anything in case of the simple issue that the petitioner wanted to withdraw this petition.

(4) (15)

3. Now, the learned counsel challenges his stand and has filed this application regarding submission of respondents. I am of the view that there is no necessity of recording the submission of the respondent as the learned counsel appearing for the respondent is present in the Court and has no grievance against non-recording of his submission.
4. This M.C.C. tantamounts to review of the order without any basis. This petition is accordingly dismissed.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge